

Interview Summary	Appli ation No. 09/725,667	Applicant(s) FELLMAN, BARRY	
	Examiner Tony Mahmoudi	Art Unit 2165	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ronald J. Schoenbaum (Attorney of Record).

(3) Tony Mahmoudi.

(2) Charles L. Rones.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 34.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner called the Attorney of Record to discuss a U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph issue with the newly amended claim 34. Claim 34 in line 13 recited: "the user may request", which presented the limitation in the alternative mode. The examiner proposed changing "the user may request" to "the user requests" to overcome the 112 second paragraph issue. The attorney agreed, and authorized the examiner to enter the change via an Examiner's Amendment.